

**REMARKS**

In the Office action, claim 5 was withdrawn; claims 1, 3, 21, 22 and 26 were rejected as unpatentable over Jahn in view of admitted prior art; claims 1-4, 12, 14, 15, 21-22 and 26 were rejected as being unpatentable over Friel in view of Jahn and admitted prior art; claims 2, 4, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn in view of Corrigan and admitted prior art; and claims 4, 13, 16, 17 and 23-25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn in view of Corrigan.

As a preliminary matter, the Office action states that Applicants earlier presented arguments were considered and addressed in the Office action, however, no such comments could be identified. Applicants respectfully request a more definite response to their arguments with the next Office action. As such remarks were not made in the Office action, Applicants are unable to respond directly, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that a Final office action would be premature absent an opportunity for Applicants to respond.

As to withdrawn claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 may be reinstated upon indication of allowable subject matter that is generic as to the material applied. Claim 1 as pending would allow claim 5 to be reinstated.

As to the rejections on the merits, it is noted that the main references cited (Jahn, Friel and Madden) all relate to making available some selections of paint and or parameters, most notably in a vehicle assembly line. The applied references thus basically presume an existing material application system and are not directed to a remote configuration concept for the material application system. It is respectfully submitted that the art of record makes no suggestion of a system that allows remote configuration of the actual material application system as presently claimed.

In order to clarify this aspect of the invention, the independent claims are amended to recite that the user selects a pump and gun from different choices thereof and that such selection is used to configure a material application system. The cited art makes no suggestion of such an arrangement. It is submitted that no one in the cited art appreciated, taught or suggested the claimed concept of configuring a material application system from a location remote from the manufacturing site wherein the user actually selects a pump and gun from different choices,

along with inputting a characteristic of the material to be applied, and further with the configuration program then verifying compatibility of the selections. Most notably, Jahn does not teach or suggest selection of the pump and gun components from different choices. At col. 6 line 60 thorough col. 7 line 2 Jahn the mathematical model has fixed factor settings based on experimental techniques. There is no apparent suggestion that the user can change these settings, much less any suggestion that the user would make selections from different pump and gun choices. Moreover as to new claim 26, there is no suggestion as to having selectable choices of control systems.

The rejections to date have been predicated on the argument that Jahn teaches selecting different parameters such as bell speed. Even if this is taken as correct for argument sake alone, such a teaching cannot suggest the present invention without application of hindsight based on Applicants own disclosure. The art of record, and most notable Jahn and the prior art discussed in the Background, offers no suggestion of a remote configuration in which a user can select among different pumps and guns to configure a spray system. The Background discussion of previous configurations performed at the manufacturing site offers no suggestion of a remote configuration as claimed, and it is believed that the Office will concur in that second and third references are combined to support an 'obviousness' rejection. Jahn is a pre-configured system in which a user can set parameters. Selecting a parameter of a pre-configured system offers no suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art the concept of configuring a system from a remote location by selecting different components of the system. Applicants disclosure alone teaches such a concept.

Applicants traverse the rejections of the dependent claims but detailed comment will be deferred pending further examination of the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 6, 2005

By:   
Leonard L. Lewis  
Reg. No. 31,176  
(216) 622-8683